

REMARKS

Claims 1-26 were pending at the time of the Office Action. Claims 6 and 24-26 are cancelled without prejudice. Claims 27 and 28 are new claims. Claims 1 and 17-23 are amended in this response. No new matter is added. Claims 1-5, 7-23, 27, and 28 are pending with claims 1, 10, and 17 being independent claims. Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3, 6, and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Ferracina (US 5,924,892), hereinafter "Ferracina."

Claims 4 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferracina.

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferracina in view of Begley (US 4,979,634), hereinafter "Begley."

Claims 2, 8, and 10-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ferracina in view of Beecher II et al. (US 6,291,767), hereinafter "Beecher."

Claims 1-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beecher in view of Begley.

Applicants respectfully disagree.

As amended, claim 1 relates to a network communication device that includes a main body, at least one connector mounted onto a surface of the main body, and an easel pivotally coupled to the main body. The easel has a hole to accept a wire or a cable for connecting to the at least one connector. Ferracina does not teach all the features of claim 1.

Ferracina describes a device for electrically powering multiple user items that includes a casing provided with an

inner compartment and multiple access apertures to said compartment when the casing is closed. See, e.g., Ferracina at Abstract. Ferracina does not describe an easel having a hole, as claimed.

The Office Action states "... Ferracina discloses the easel 6 contains at least one hole 10 for excepting [sic] at least one wire or cable." See, Office Action, page 3, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph. In Ferracina, reference numeral 6 refers to a portion of a casing. Thus, the Office contends that a portion of Ferracina's casing includes the claimed hole. Applicants respectfully disagree.

The Office contends that Ferracina's portion 6 is the claimed easel. See, e.g., Office Action, page 2, 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph. Without conceding the Office's position, Applicants respectfully submit that, unless Ferracina discloses a hole in portion 6, then Ferracina does not teach "the easel including a hole," as claimed. As discussed below, Ferracina clearly does not teach a hole in portion 6.

Ferracina teaches two portions 6 and 7 hinged together along corresponding walls 6A and 7A and fixable in the closed position by fastening members. See, e.g., Ferracina, col. 2, lines 4-8. Further, Ferracina states:

In the walls 6B and 6D and in the walls 7B and 7D there are provided apertures or recesses 10 and 11 respectively, which when the casing is closed meet to create passages 12 through the casing walls. Electrical and/or data transfer cables 13 ... pass through these passages from the casing 2 ...

See, Ferracina, col. 2, lines 16-21.

As disclosed in Ferracina, the walls include apertures which when the casing is closed meet to create passages for passing data transfer cables 13.

By themselves, the apertures in Ferracina's portion 6 are not holes. Rather, Ferracina's apertures form a passage when

the portions 6 and 7 of the casing are closed. This is clearly illustrated in Ferracina in FIGS. 1 and 2. In FIG. 1 in Ferracina, reference numerals 10 and 11 on portions 6 and 7, respectively, are apertures that form passage 12 (Ferracina, FIG. 2), when portions 6 and 7 are brought together to close the casing. Thus, while Ferracina's casing forms a passage when the portions 6 and 7 are closed, neither portion 6 nor portion 7 in Ferracina, by itself, includes a hole.

Because Ferracina does not teach "the easel having a hole," as claimed, Ferracina does not teach all the features of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over Ferracina. Claims 2-5 and 7-9 are also patentable at least for similar reasons and for the additional recitations that they contain.

For example, claim 7 describes the claimed easel including a stop to prevent the easel from pivoting too far. The suggested combination of Ferracina and Begley does not describe or suggest all the features of claim 7.

Begley teaches a hold-open hinge mechanism for a molded plastic rainproof cover for a circuit breaker. See, e.g., Begley at Abstract. Begley does not disclose an easel with a hole. The Office contends that Begley's cover member that is held open by Begley's hinge mechanism is the claimed easel. See, Office Action, page 4, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph. However, Begley's cover member does not include a hole. Further, Begley's rainproof cover for a circuit breaker does not have a connector to which a wire or cable can be connected. Therefore, Begley's rainproof cover does not require a hole. Because the suggested combination of Ferracina and Begley do not teach an easel including a hole, as claimed, claim 7 is patentable.

Also, for example, claim 2 describes at least one networking circuit located inside the main body that is coupled with the at least one connector, and electromagnetic

interference shielding mounted onto the main body. The suggested combination of Ferracina and Beecher does not teach an easel including a hole.

Beecher teaches a data/communications distribution box that forms an interior space which when closed with a cover includes multiple cable openings adapted to permit the passage of cable into and out of the interior space. See, e.g., Beecher at Abstract. The Office contends that Beecher teaches the claimed at least one networking circuit. Beecher teaches multiple connectors connected to the distribution box. See, e.g., Beecher, figs. 1-6. Thus, the Office contends that Beecher's distribution box is the claimed main body and that Beecher's cover is the claimed easel.

Beecher's easel does not include a hole. As illustrated in Beecher, Beecher's cover includes arcuate notches 66. See, e.g., Beecher, col. 3, lines 48-53, fig. 2. reference numeral 66. Beecher's arcuate notches are not holes. Thus, the suggested combination of Ferracina and Beecher does not teach all the features of claim 2. Accordingly, claim 2 is patentable.

Further, for reasons discussed previously, neither Beecher nor Begley, taken alone or in any combination describe or suggest the claimed easel including a hole. At least for this reason, this suggested combination does not teach all the features of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 and all claims dependent therefrom are patentable over the suggested combination of Beecher and Begley.

As amended, claim 17 recites "A network communication housing comprising: an easel including a bottom surface, a front surface inclined relative to the bottom surface, and a foot for supporting the easel, the foot positioned on the front surface; and a main body pivotally coupled with a side surface of the

easel, the main body including an edge that overlaps an edge of the front surface of the easel, wherein, when the main body is pivoted about the side surface, the edge of the main body and the foot cause the main body and the easel to stand on a horizontal surface." (Emphasis added).

Ferracina or Beecher, taken alone or in combination, does not teach all the features of claim 17. Neither Ferracina nor Beecher describe or suggest "a foot for supporting the easel, the foot positioned on the front surface," as claimed. The Office contends that it would have been obvious to employ at least one foot for supporting the main body as needed. See, e.g., Office Action, page 5, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Ferracina's casing does not require a foot for stabilizing or supporting the casing. Portions 6 and 7 of Ferracina's casing include flat surfaces that will necessarily be stable when placed on a horizontal surface. Further, including a foot on a front surface of a portion of Ferracina's casing will not allow the edge of the casing and the foot to cause the portions of the casing to stand on a horizontal surface. Rather, the presence of the foot on one portion alone will cause the casing to be unstable. Thus, Ferracina's casing teaches away from including a foot on a front surface of a portion.

Thus, the suggested combination of Ferracina and Beecher does not describe or suggest the claimed foot. Further, Ferracina teaches away from including the claimed foot on a portion of Ferracina's casing. Therefore, a *prima facie* case of obviousness is not established. Accordingly, claim 17 is patentable. Claims 18-23, 27, and 28 are also patentable at least for reasons similar to claim 17 and for the additional recitations that they contain.

Claim 17 and all claims dependent therefrom are patentable over the suggested combination of Beecher and Begley at least for reasons discussed previously.

Claim 10 recites "A method of coupling a wire or cable to a network device comprising a main body, networking circuitry, at least one connector mounted on the main body and coupled to the networking circuitry, and an easel, the method comprising: coupling the wire or cable to the at least one connector; securing the wire or cable into a notch on a serrated edge on the easel; and pivoting the main body and easel to provide tension on the wire or cable." (Emphasis added).

The Office contends that claim 10 and all claims dependent therefrom correspond to the network communication housing of claims 1-9 and are, therefore, rejected under the same rationale. See, e.g., Office Action, page 5, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph, page 7, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph.

Applicants respectfully submit that neither Ferracina nor Beecher nor Begley, taken alone or in any combination, describe or suggest "securing the wire or cable into a notch on a serrated edge on the easel; and pivoting the main body and easel to provide tension on the wire or cable," as recited in claim 10. Should the Office maintain its rejection of claim 10, Applicants respectfully request that the Office identify portions of the references that, either taken alone or in combination, that teach these features of claim 10.

Absent such showing, the Office has not stated the reasons for rejecting claim 10 together with such information as may be useful in judging of the propriety of continuing the prosecution of claim 10, as required by 35 U.S.C. §132. Further, absent such showing, the rejection of claim 10 is purely conclusory.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that the Office's conclusion that claim 10 corresponds to the network

communication housing of claim 1 is incorrect. Simply because claims 1 and 10 share similar language does not imply that the two claims correspond to each other. To reject claim 1 as being unpatentable over one or a combination of the cited references, the Office must show that either one or a combination of the cited references teach "coupling the wire or cable to the at least one connector; securing the wire or cable into a notch on a serrated edge on the easel; and pivoting the main body and easel to provide tension on the wire or cable." In the present application, the Office has made no such showing.

Because no combination of Ferracina, Beecher and Begley describes or suggests all the features of claim 10, claim 10 and all claims dependent therefrom are patentable.

#### CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the remarks made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicant asks that all claims be allowed. Please apply any credits or charges to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 28, 2008

/ Sushil Shrinivasan L0368 /  
Sushil Shrinivasan  
Reg. No. L0368

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
PTO Customer No.: 20985  
12390 El Camino Real  
San Diego, California 92130  
(858) 678-5070 telephone  
(858) 678-5099 facsimile

10838538.doc